

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2009
REGIONAL TRIBAL WATER PLENARY MEETING #7
Far Northern California Waters
hosted by Shasta Indian Nation, June 13, 2009, Yreka, CA

MEETING SUMMARY

Table of Contents

(1) Opening Prayer and Welcome.....	1
(2) The California Water Plan Update 2009 and Tribal Engagement.....	2
(3) <u>Presentation</u> : Mercury Contamination and Fish Consumption Issues.....	3
(4) <u>Presentation</u> : Native Americans, Native Plants, and Watershed Restoration on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest.....	5
(5) <u>Presentation</u> : Shasta River Rehabilitation	6
(6) <u>Presentation</u> : Spring Water Resources and Integrated Regional Water Management Planning	7
(7) <u>Presentation</u> : Groundwater in Siskiyou County	9
(8) <u>General Discussion</u> : Tribal Communication	11
(9) <u>Guest Speakers</u> : The Sacredness of Water	11
(10) Closing Prayer	12
(11) Attendance.....	13
(12) Mind Map	14

(1) Opening Prayer and Welcome

Franklin Thom, Karuk, opened the meeting with a prayer song. He came because he cares deeply about Ishi Pishi Falls, where the salmon come and his people look forward to catching them. His song-prayer was dedicated to the people gathered in the room, to the green water, to the creeks, and to the mountains, and to help everyone speak right that day.

Larry Doke, Chairman of the Shasta Indian Nation, and William Speer, Shasta Indian Nation Council Member, also welcomed people to the meeting, and expressed their thanks for people taking the time to gather.

People then introduced themselves.

Dorian Fougères, facilitator with the Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS, lastly welcomed people. He explained that the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Government and Community Liaison, Barbara Cross, had a family emergency and was unexpectedly not able to make the meeting. Dorian walked participants through the agenda, and explained he would assist in moving the meeting along and the discussions.

(2) The California Water Plan Update 2009 and Tribal Engagement

Via a recorded video, Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager for Statewide Integrated Water Management, California Department of Water Resources, described the collaborative processes which led to the development of the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2009. The full set of slides from Kamyar's presentation can be downloaded under the Regional Tribal Water Plenary materials on the main Tribal Communication webpage, <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/tribal2>

Given that Barbara Cross could not attend, Dorian followed Kamyar's presentation with a summary of Tribal participation in the process to date. He reviewed the work of the Tribal Communication Committee, which had been meeting since October 2007 and produced a Tribal Communication Plan in the summer of 2008; the Tribal Water Stories Project; and the Tribal Water Summit planning process, including its Planning Team. Dorian explained that all people with an interest are encouraged and invited to participate in the monthly planning meetings for the Summit. Dorian indicated that input from each Regional Tribal meeting will be shared with following meetings, and that the series of mind maps in people's packets gave a quick overview of the results of earlier meetings.

DISCUSSION:

1. It was requested that a **conference call** be set up for Kamyar and Barbara to answer substantive questions about the Water Plan, given that neither could attend the meeting in person.
2. Participants emphasized that Tribes are sovereign governments, and therefore the Department should be obtaining input on the Water Plan through consultation, which is the required **government-to-government relationship**. A participant noted that DWR typically defers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs on such matters, but that this is not satisfactory. He encouraged Tribes to go to DWR and demand that they come out and speak directly with the Tribe.
3. It was suggested that DWR should also mitigate for the **negative impacts of past water projects**.
4. It was noted that the State agency organization chart is confusing, and that simple materials are easier to understand.
5. A participant expressed strong concern for **cultural resource protection**. The waters in her areas are polluted from cattle and rice fields and leach lines, and she can no longer fish or swim or use the water in many other ways. Her cultural and religious practices are constrained because of this. For her, "water quality" standards are a misnomer – they do not guarantee quality water. A better standard, she suggested, would be that waters are pure enough to drink.

6. A participant also had concerns about **Tribal communication** associated with the Water Plan. Please see **section #8 below**, which is dedicated to communication issues.
7. The importance of **understanding water from a cultural perspective** was also emphasized. This is because from a cultural perspective all people and all living relations are connected, including water. So water cannot be separated from the land or air or animals or plants or people. Oftentimes the way water is talked about by agencies or represented in the media is as something that is disconnected, or the information is inaccurate. This is a problem. The interpretation of people's concerns matters, and who enunciates these concerns matters. It was asked, are the people on the Tribal Communication Committee and Tribal Water Summit Planning Team understanding and representing water from a cultural perspective? One member of the Committee then spoke in detail about her background and the cultural perspective she and her colleagues have brought to the process from the start.

(3) Presentation: Mercury Contamination and Fish Consumption Issues

Sherri Norris, Executive Director of the California Indian Environmental Alliance, and her colleague Paloma Flores presented on mercury contamination in California and associated fish consumption and health concerns. Sherri's presentation can be downloaded under the Regional Tribal Water Plenary materials on the main Tribal Communication webpage, <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/tribal2>. Sherri explained how mercury moves through the environment, from gold and mercury mining (and dredging) through mixing with decaying plant matter and methylation and microorganisms and into fish, which then accumulate mercury and are eaten by people. She noted that there are studies about the scale of contamination but these have to be carefully interpreted – a water body may not have an advisory because it has not yet been tested, not because it has been certified as clean. She then explained possible health effects, and closed with healthy diets and eating practices. She also distributed a fish consumption brochure and noted that while there are health risks, there are also health benefits from eating fish, so this must be balanced. For the latest information and consumption guidelines, including which fish are more and less risky, she encouraged people to visit their website and sign up for CIEA's monthly newsletter, which is distributed electronically. Both the website and brochures are being updated and will be ready for distribution on June 24, 2009. Also, Paloma will be presenting and leading trainings at community events and to Indian Health Centers in the area in July and August. CIEA's website is <http://www.cieaweb.org>

DISCUSSION:

1. A participant noted that Hat Creek – categorized as “clean” by the State Water Resources Control Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program – is anything but clean. The **categorizations need to be ground-truthed** with common sense.
2. It was suggested that Tribes should get conduct their own **Tribal mercury testing activities**. This would reduce their dependence on state agencies. It was also suggested that agencies

should nonetheless subsidize Tribal testing activities, as this was a service to everyone in California.

3. It was asked whether **open-air fish markets** are regulated for safe consumption.
4. Participants asked whether the health risks of mercury associated with **using and eating plant materials** has been evaluated, for example, eating or using tules or seaweed or other native plants. While it was known that plant materials could take up mercury, studies about specific plants are incomplete. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control is working with Tribes in Cache Creek watershed to test materials. Mercury can be ingested by breathing in mercury vapor, created by heating mercury. It was suggested that better outreach is needed to explain these risks, e.g, to communities around Clear Lake.
5. It was asked whether **floodplains** were a site of methylation, given that many native cultures construct buildings on the floodplain and dance in those areas. Sherri noted that they could be a major source of methylation. Rice, for example, is a source of methylation, and being studied in the Yolo Bypass.
6. It was asked whether there are ways to **minimize the methylation of mercury** in the environment. Sherri explained that scientists were trying to find ways, but there are concerns about unintended consequences and effects of trying to alter natural processes.
7. Several participants expressed that the **amount of fish recommended for eating** is very small and unacceptable from a cultural standpoint.
8. It was asked whether there is a difference between **drinking and eating mercury**. Sherri noted that unmethylated mercury in water would pass through the system, but methylated mercury would be taken up if it were ingested through eating fish or other activities.
9. While the effects of mercury on women, particularly pregnant women, are well-documented, participants asked whether the **effects on men** were well-known. Sherri explained that less is known about how mercury affects men, although studies have found a link to Alzheimer's disease, heart disease, and decreased sperm counts.
10. Sherri noted that mercury assessments should be put in context: mercury is often accompanied by **other contaminants**. Therefore, even if an assessment finds that mercury in a particular water body is a minor threat, there may be other risks associated with that water.
11. Participants asked how they could **support CIEA's** work. Sherri explained that people can help by hosting or sponsoring outreach, activities, events, and training, and of course donations are always welcome. She also encouraged people to visit their website and sign up for their newsletter to stay abreast of CIEA activities.

(4) Presentation: Native Americans, Native Plants, and Watershed Restoration on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest

Julie Cassidy, Heritage Resources, Mt. Shasta Ranger Station, U.S. Forest Service, presented on collaborative efforts between the Forest Service and Tribes in the region to restore parts of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. This work has been going on for nearly 15 years. Julie's slides illustrated the variety of situations in which the restoration has been occurring, and the associated practices undertaken by native people from the Pit River, Winnemem Wintu, Shasta Indian Nation, and other Tribes. Activities include spring restoration, meadow restoration, seed collection, plantings in sensitive and burned areas, and a traditional gathering policy greenhouse celebration. Julie's presentation can be downloaded at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/tribal2>.

DISCUSSION:

1. A participant commented that the indigenous plants **greenhouse** was impressive. She asked **whether the plants were sold**. Julie explained that some plants were given away, particularly to support revegetation partnerships on forest land or on Tribal land. However, the greenhouse did not sell plants to support corporate revegetation efforts.
2. It was suggested that Tribes should build their own **greenhouses to further restoration efforts**, and to share knowledge about how to cultivate and use the plants.
3. A participant asked about the **interpretive watershed work** that the Forest Service is beginning, in particular, whose language would be used in the project? Julie explained that the interpretive work would focus on themes of resource use, and that local tribes would help develop the appropriate language.
4. It was asked how Tribes can hasten efforts to get rid of non-native plants. It was noted that **burning is a traditional practice** that has been outlawed, with only a few limited, small-scale burns permitted these days. It was strongly emphasized that Tribes need a champion for their burning practices, someone who can advocate for and explain their importance and change policies. Julie noted that burning was a complex practice, and that there are burn windows and other restrictions on what the Forest Service can do. It was strongly emphasized that the Forest Service should involve Tribes in conducting burns.
5. It was asked whether the Forest Service will enter into **programmatic agreements with non-federally recognized Tribes**. Julie noted that "participating agreements" that involve cost-sharing programs and memoranda of understanding are what the Forest Service uses. The participant explained that recognized Tribes can access funding and enter into agreements with the Forest Service, but non-recognized Tribes – described as "un-reckoned with" Tribes – cannot. He strongly suggested that recognition status should be on the back-burner when it comes to restoration efforts – restoration hinges upon living on the land and knowing the land, not about a federal designation.

Another participant noted that the Pit River Tribe has an MOU (for principles and protocols), and that individual bands have MOAs (for projects). There is an umbrella

agreement that is planned to include the Winnemem Wintu, but Pacific Gas and Electric, which runs hydropower dams in the region, does not recognize this umbrella during negotiations.

6. It was strongly suggested that Tribes, particularly those in Northern California, need to **speak with one voice** to ensure that agencies recognize them and take their concerns seriously. It was noted that even federally-recognized Tribes in the area are not receiving the funding or being asked to join the projects that they as sovereign nations have a right to. It was noted that the Tribal Water Summit will provide the opportunity to speak as one voice on water rights.
7. A participant asked whether **stimulus money** was available to support restoration efforts. Julie explained that stimulus money was only available to support the creation of fire breaks.
8. A participant noted that **mandatory state park closures** would have a major impact on fire prevention, access to native plants, and access to emergency services. She noted that closing parks turns native people into criminals by forcing them to trespass, even though native people never surrendered their aboriginal rights to hunt, fish, and gather.

(5) Presentation: Shasta River Rehabilitation

Supervisor Jim Cook, Siskiyou County, presented on the past work of the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District (RCD), and more recent activities he was involved in. Most of the presentation focused on work done along the Shasta River, beginning with a group of landowners who designated a series of management objectives many years ago that focused on reducing water temperatures, increasing levels of dissolved oxygen, reducing fine sediment in streams, and improving fish passage and screening. The activities included

- riparian zone livestock control fencing and crossing lanes
- pulsed water flows to improve smolt survival
- biotechnical bank protection
- the Araujo small dam removal (involving five ranches and five state and federal agencies)
- tailwater analysis and reduction projects
- the Yreka Greenway project
- floodplain restoration efforts, and
- water quality monitoring activities involving Tribes

Supervisor Cook also noted the RCD's major goals. He explained that ranchers that were part of the RCD had lived on and made a living from the land for several generations. He felt that most people want to "do the right thing", are willing to take advice, and are willing to "do the right thing" even if it costs them some money. However, he also noted several challenges the RCD faces, including the need to increase partnerships, obtain funding in a timely fashion, increase awareness and support of non-agricultural residents, overcome permitting and other legal hurdles, and have engineering and design assistance for projects.

DISCUSSION:

1. It was asked, how can Tribes **build effective partnerships**? People suggested multiple paths, including
 - a. establishing personal relationships with people
 - b. exerting influence as Tribes on the county
 - c. demanding inclusion in Integrated Regional Water Management Plans and Total Maximum Daily Load planning processes
 - d. getting involved in the region's Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) effort
 - e. developing MOAs between Tribes and Siskiyou County, to establish two-way paths of outreach and dialogue
 - f. expanding the view of the region and setting up a new Integrated Regional Water Management Plan with Modoc County
2. It was noted that even if governments and organizations and do not agree on practices or solutions, they can at least identify common goals before they develop a plan.
3. It was emphasized that tight funding makes it essential to **collaborate as a community that includes all people**, Tribal and non-Tribal. It was also commented that if ranchers could find agreement like they did in Supervisor Cook's presentation, Tribes could unite as well.
4. For the **interpretive work**, the earlier question was reiterated – Whose language would be used? Jim explained that the interpretive work would be sure to include traditional knowledge and values.
5. A participant asked, **Who defines progress?** She noted that Tribal and rancher views of progress can differ significantly, so how can people in the region find a middle ground, a common path? Jim replied that he didn't have a clear answer, but that he felt **"solutions" were really always works in progress**, and had to continue to be worked on and developed and refined as people work together and get to know each other better and build trust. \
6. It was asked whether ranchers approved of **mining and dredging**, given its water quality impacts, and if so, how this might be mitigated. It was noted that there is a federal bill to stop dredging, but that Siskiyou County did not support it.
7. A participant asked how the county is working on **water quality**. Jim noted that land use and development have a huge effect on habitat and water. The need for septic improvements was also noted.

(6) Presentation: Spring Water Resources and Integrated Regional Water Management Planning

Meadow Barr, a consultant with California Trout, presented on three issues. She first provided an update on the McCloud/Nestle bottling proposal, which was canceled in the summer of 2008,

but Nestle is pushing to re-open negotiations. She noted that the *Protect Our Waters Coalition* had formed to protect Mount Shasta's unique water supply by investing in science, education, and policy analysis.

Meadow then introduced the Mount Shasta Springs Study, which focuses on a first-order characterization of spring water from the Shasta, Upper Sacramento, and McCloud Rivers, as well as groundwater analysis. She explained the science behind the isotope analysis that helps to show whether the spring water is thermally influenced, how it recharges, and its overall vulnerability. She also explained that California Trout was developing an interactive series of computer maps on Google Earth that would allow people to click on individual springs and pull up detailed information about them.

Lastly, Meadow reviewed the recently submitted application for an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. She explained how this had grown out of the Regional Watershed Management Group, which included the Winnemem Wintu and local governments and organizations. She noted that a preliminary interview in early June went well, and it would take two to three months to hear if the proposal was approved. If approved, and the state budget is also approved, \$30 million will be available to support IRWMPs across California next year, and the new IRWMP would be eligible for a portion of this.

DISCUSSION:

1. A participant noted that there were many problems with the **Nestle Environmental Impact Review**, including the presence of large amounts of asbestos in the old mill they planned to convert into the bottling plant. Another participant noted that the EIR ignored sound and air quality impacts associated with the plant and traffic, as well as safety issues from traffic and the carbon footprint associated with trucking water to Los Angeles.
2. It was emphasized that the **entire Mount Shasta is sacred** – that there should be no commercial or residential development, but the State keeps finding new ways to encourage this.
3. It was noted that **language matters** – terms like “sacred” and “precious” have important meanings.
4. It was noted that Nestle is not alone – **many companies want to privatize water**, this is a global trend. Nestle was only able to make the proposal here because our standards are lower than those in its home country, Switzerland. The desire to privatize water raises major issues about the long-term availability and sustainability of water resources.
5. **Geothermal power generation** was also as a major concern (see #6 below). It was noted that the Federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 pushed for issuing permits to explore geothermal power on Mount Shasta.
6. It was noted that even **exploration associated with bottling and geothermal power** can have negative impacts. For example, drilling into Mount Shasta's caverns can affect the

water pressure in surrounding parts of the mountain. For example, geothermal power exploration has increased the temperature of Medicine Lake, in turn increasing algal blooms.

7. It was commented that Tribal involvement in the IRWMP would be beneficial – it would help to build allies, share the work that needs to be done, and bring help and resources to Tribal communities.
8. It was emphasized that Tribes need to use their **sovereignty status at the international level** to have their concerns addressed. It was noted that the United Nations' Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues has an annual conference, and that their proceedings and information is accessible on the internet.

(7) Presentation: Groundwater in Siskiyou County

Mike Ward, DWR Northern Region, presented on groundwater in Siskiyou County. He began with an overview of the Northern Region's data collection activities, including groundwater level monitoring, groundwater and surface water chemistry, land and water use, and surface water measurements. He then reviewed groundwater conditions in 2009 for Butte Valley, Scotts Valley, and Shasta Valley, showing their monitoring grids and explaining how the groundwater levels changed over time. He noted there is a need for greater data in Scotts Valley. Lastly, he reviewed efforts to assess the groundwater data needs for Shasta Valley. His maps illustrated the high complexity of groundwater sources and flows and recharge in the region, and how this correlated with applied water sources, stream temperature, and groundwater chemistry. Mike then summarized major data needs that had been identified, including impacts of resource management activities and planning data to inform future development. He noted that a Technical Advisory Committee will be formed in coming months, and public outreach will also be conducted. He encouraged interested people to follow the work of the TAC, which would share information and help to educate people.

DISCUSSION:

1. A participant asked whether DWR conducted **water quality assessments**, and whether there was support for Tribes to assess water quality on their lands. Mike noted that there was a water quality section of the office, but that hard rock aquifers are very difficult to characterize (as illustrated by his complex slides). They must be assessed on a case-by-case basis, and he expects the results would be similar to the data displayed.
2. It was asked whether DWR needs access to more **sites to monitor groundwater**. Mike noted that the rural Shasta Valley lacks much data, and that all monitoring is voluntary. He noted that the Resource Conservation District does some monitoring work also but does not share this data with the public. In some cases monitoring is not welcome by landowners. That said, DWR does work with monitoring cooperators, and teaches people how to measure groundwater levels and assigns them an official data number.

3. Mike noted that the **Technical Advisory Committee** that is being convened will involve agencies and irrigation districts and other interested parties. He felt this would provide a forum for dialogue and forging consensus on data needs, for sharing information, and for bringing a **cultural perspective** to bear on data, if Tribes participated.
4. It was noted that groundwater levels in an area might not support **development**, and that there needs to be a place where people can go to learn what's sustainable. The need to **map recharge areas** was noted, as well as the need to communicate to developers where they should and should not build. Mike noted that this was a county responsibility and involved ensuring that appropriate zoning codes exist. It was noted that since DWR serves as a data repository it should play a more active role in helping counties direct development to appropriate areas.
5. A participant asked whether language exists that can further the **protection of groundwater resources**. Mike noted that it is possible to encourage agencies to develop groundwater management plans and put appropriate principles in place. DWR Local Groundwater Assistance Program (**AB 303**) **grants** are available for this, but they are extremely competitive and involve agencies and organizations that have already established plans. "Basin Management Objectives" and also **groundwater management districts** also exist, which have some legal foundation but in practice do not have much power or enforcement capacity. He also noted that the Shasta RCD has a **groundwater capacity building grant**, which should help to build community consensus around the need to protect groundwater resources.
6. It was asked whether there were any analysis of how **north-south water connections, including the State Water Project**, affected groundwater in California. For example, cutbacks on water deliveries could encourage groundwater overdraft, as was occurring in Glenn County. Mike noted that in some areas the overdraft was severe. He noted that DWR had established a 2009 Drought Water Bank. Through this DWR will purchase water from willing sellers, primarily from water suppliers upstream of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and then transfer it using State Water Project (SWP) or Central Valley Project (CVP) facilities to water suppliers that are at risk of experiencing water shortages. He noted that people had mixed feelings about this work, which effectively pays people to avoid using their surface flows and instead drawdown groundwater.
7. A participant asked whether there are ways to measure the **impacts of groundwater pumping** associated with agriculture or bottling on wells on aquifers and streams, and whether there were any controls on this. Mike replied that assessing impacts first requires building up a historical record, and then comparing this with current data. This can be time-consuming and difficult.
8. After the meeting a participant requested that another item be added to the notes: the potential for hydrogen-based automobiles, which will require water, to threaten water supplies.

(8) General Discussion: Tribal Communication

In the last portion of the meeting participants discussed the need for better Tribal communication, involving the Water Plan but extending to all water-related issues in the region.

1. It was asked, how do Tribes fit in the Water Plan? It was stressed that the California Water Plan needs a **greater Tribal voice** on its Advisory Committee, and greater communication with the Tribes that were not in the room. It was suggested that people show up at Water Plan meetings and make their voices heard. It was noted that Tribal leaders are needed in positions of power.
2. In particular, **communication with elders** and bringing their voices into the process was noted as extremely important.
3. The importance of identifying **the right people to talk with in a Tribe**, and getting accurate information to them was emphasized. The importance of increasing the understanding and involvement of Tribal councils was noted as a starting point. It was noted that many outreach efforts can be made but some Tribes do not respond as they do not think their voice will change the outcomes.
4. Participants stressed, how will this region link Tribal governments with cities, counties, and corporations, as well as federal and state agencies? Participants emphasized the need for **regional management** that breaks down bureaucracy.
5. The need for people who can translate native perspectives and **interpret for agencies** in the right terms was noted as critical, and vice versa – the ability to express technical terms in simple language was needed as well. Along the same lines, the need for explaining concerns to **younger generations** and getting them involved was emphasized. The need to both women and men was noted.
6. It was recommended that communication and outreach involve **the grassroots**, and encourage people to stand up and talk and demand recognition. It was recommended to assemble a list of all the people who already *are* involved and interested, and build upon their commitments.
7. The need for people to **come together as a group**, rather than Tribe by Tribe, was stressed.

(9) Guest Speakers: The Sacredness of Water

Mark Franco, Headman of the Winnemem Wintu, spoke about the sacredness of water. Mark noted that just as water nourished people in the past, today's meeting and information also provided nourishment. He applauded people for coming and making their voices heard to people who do not care to hear or understand. He stressed that Tribes should demand that DWR come and talk to them, as DWR's mind frame has changed enough – this would not have been possible five years ago, Tribes would have been sent to the BIA. He explained that these aren't "state

water projects” or “federal water projects”, they are Tribal water projects. He noted that the bubbles coming up from a Mount Shasta spring are like the bubbles a person makes leaving the womb, that the earth is our mother, the water is its blood, and we have responsibility to it just as we do to our own mothers. He recommended people stop being suspicious of each other and open their eyes and let others see what’s in our hearts. He explained that in the past his people’s prayer warriors sung and prayed and danced for things, and that today people can do the same thing as water warriors by praying for it in their own ways. He noted that the Water Plan Update 2013 will start in 2010, and that although there was not much time to get involved in Update 2009, there had been seven regional meetings and now Tribes could be like a mole at the base of a dam and from a little hole release the pressure that’s built up behind the dam and bring down the giant concrete edifice. Therefore he asked that when people in the room get called on to bring their voices into the conversation that they be willing to travel and attend events. He explained that when the Winnemem declared war on the United States that 80 newspapers around the world picked up the story, and the declaration raised awareness that people were being hurt – that raising the dam and hurting the river and salmon was like genocide for his people. He explained that he would not ask his leader to attend the Tribal Water Summit unless the Governor, the Secretary for Natural Resources, and the Attorney General were there, because Tribes were bringing their chairpersons and traditional leaders. He will only sit with people who can answer questions and carry forward their intent in a good way. If the Governor is not there, this will be an insult, as the Water Plan Tribal meetings have been in good faith.\

Atta Stevenson also spoke about the sacredness of water. She explained that agencies still do not understand the basics of Tribal government, and the nuances and differences between treaties, state and federal recognition, communities, allottees, or census categories. She reminded people that what happens with water in California impacts three neighboring states as well as Mexico. Although Tribes do not have a lot of experience with bringing their voices into policy conversations, she argued that the people Tribes need to persuade are precisely their biggest critics. She explained that she’s not a scientist but she knows how the land, water, medicinal plants, and elders fit together. She explained that the struggle is difficult – Tribal people have to educate, to use mutual respect, to use a kind voice when they really want to yell, and there is no time to eat because there is no comfort. Mainstream society does not want her interpretations, but it’s up to Tribal people to explain the danger of developing on floodplains and other bad practices. Fire insurance is skyrocketing because the lack of traditional burns, for example. So she encouraged people in the room to bring their voices and outside interpretations and common sense into the conversations. She explained that water can’t be isolated, it’s part of everything, and Tribes need to communicate and share knowledge. Some water bodies are contaminated and it’s unsafe to use the plants, but nobody every tells Tribes this. She felt it was incumbent upon the people in the room to speak for all our relations, whether through emails or telephone calls or sending their leaders to make their voices heard.

(10) Closing Prayer

Franklin Thom closed the meeting with a prayer song. He dedicated the prayer song to the salmon, as the stories and discussions during the day made him think of his relatives and the importance of what people were talking about, their history and their culture and their relations.

He sang the song and said the prayer for the rivers, for the creeks, for the people, and for the cultures.

(11) Attendance

- 1) Meadow Barr, California Trout
- 2) Wendy Boggs, Shasta Indian Nation
- 3) Julie Cassidy, U.S. Forest Service
- 4) Jerome Conrad, Karuk
- 5) Jim Cook, Siskiyou County Supervisor
- 6) Elaine Doke
- 7) Larry M. Doke, Shasta Indian Nation
- 8) Pat Fletcher, Shasta Indian
- 9) Paloma Flores, California Indian Environmental Alliance
- 10) Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
- 11) Mark Franco, Winnemem
- 12) Julie Griffith-Flatter, Sierra Nevada Conservancy
- 13) William R. Hager, Shasta Indian
- 14) Roy Hall, Shasta Nation
- 15) Dorothy Irwin, Shasta Nation
- 16) Lavon Kent, concerned individual
- 17) Neal Malmsten, Redding Rancheria
- 18) Rose Mose, California Indian Heritage Council
- 19) Sherri Norris, California Indian Environmental Alliance
- 20) Karol Purcell, Shasta Nation
- 21) Frank Ramirez, The Americas Group, Apache
- 22) Ida Riggins, Pit River Tribe
- 23) Cecilia Silvas, Pit River
- 24) John W. Souza, Shasta
- 25) Lynda Speer, Pomo Shasta
- 26) Robert A. Speer, Shasta
- 27) William Speer, Sr., Shasta Indian Nation
- 28) Franklin Thom, Karuk Tribe
- 29) Lisa Vasquez, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
- 30) Bruce Vidal, Shasta Nation
- 31) Eric Vidal, Shasta Indian
- 32) Shannon Walter, Karuk
- 33) Michael Ward, California Department of Water Resources
- 34) Frank Yonemura
- 35) Randy Yonemura, California Indian Heritage Council